REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were presented for examination, are pending and are rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Restriction Requirement

The applicants hereby affirm the Election, of Group 1, claims 1-8, made by Alan Thompson; however, the traversal is hereby withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 Second Paragraph Rejections

Claims 3, 5 and 6 are rejected as being indefinite.

Claim 3 has been canceled; however, its limitations have been placed into claim 1, where they have been clarified in accordance with the specification to define the weight of the hydrophobic materials relative to the weight of the detoxifying reagent. See e.g., paragraph 15, lines 2-4 and paragraph 16, lines 4-6.

The Markush language of claims 5 and 6 has been corrected.

Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are rejected as being anticipated by JP Patent Publication Number 08-227204. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the weight of the hydrophobic nanoparticle material is within the range of 3-7% of the weight of the detoxifying reagent. This produces a weak encapsulating coating that breaks down when the coating comes in contact with a hydrophobic chemical agent or a hydrophobic biological agent. The reference provides sustained release detoxifying reagents based on a much more durable coating.

Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 3 is are rejected as being unpatentable over JP Patent Publication Number 08-227204. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 has been canceled. However, since the limitations of claim 3 have been placed into claim 1, the rejection is addressed.

The concentration range of 3-7% refers to the weight of the coating of hydrophobic nanoparticle material relative to the weight of the detoxifying reagent. As discussed in paragraph 15 of the application, the recited concentration range provides a weak porous nanoparticle coating that will break down when it comes into contact with a hydrophobic chemical agent or a hydrophobic biological agent. The reference teaches a coating that provides a gradual release (sustained release) of a detoxifying reagent.

Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8 are are rejected as being unpatentable over JP Patent Publication Number 08-227204 in view of Murphy et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 should be allowable because it depends from claim 1. Claim 8 has been canceled.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutte et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Unlike the applicants' amended claim 1, the reference lacks any teaching of a solid-water material for detoxifying a hydrophobic chemical agent or a hydrophobic biological agent, comprising a detoxifying reagent, and a hydrophobic nanoparticle material encapsulating the detoxifying reagent to form a porous coating, where the hydrophobic nanoparticle material comprises a weight that is 3-7% of the weight of the detoxifying reagent to result in a hydrophobic nanoparticle material that readily breaks down when it comes in contact with the hydrophobic chemical agent or the hydrophobic biological agent. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutte et al. in view of Herzog. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claim 5 should be withdrawn because it depends from claim 1, which should be allowable as discussed above.

Conclusions

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance based on claims 1 and 4-7 in view of the amendments thereto and the foregoing comments.

If any impediments remain to prompt allowance of the case, please contact the undersigned at 808-875-0012.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Wooldridge
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,725

Dated: September 19, 2005